

Edward Raymond Turner

of the University of Michigan

Apostle and Apologist of Reaction

**His Widely Advertised Book, "England and Ireland,"
Proclaimed "Impartial, Comprehensive and
Authoritative," is a Mass of
Misinformation**

By DANIEL T. O'CONNELL, LL. D.

Member, American Bar Association

Director, Irish National Bureau

1919

**IRISH NATIONAL BUREAU
WASHINGTON, D. C.**



INTRODUCTION

Ireland has for centuries been subjected to systematic misrepresentation of her history and her people by wily English propagandists. The freedom-loving people of other lands who, if they knew the truth, would sympathize with the Irish nation, have been carefully blinded by a veil of misinformation designed to create hostility to the Irish. This English propaganda has been particularly active in the United States in the past, and is seemingly at its height here today.

Lord Northcliffe, the English editor and publisher, whose wealth and initiative make him especially powerful, is particularly active in the work of deluging America with English propaganda. He realizes that Americans of Irish blood have awakened America to the peril which confronts it in the English attempt to break down our century-long traditions and to make the United States an ally of England. It is in a desperate effort to stay this rising tide of popular opinion that England is today doing her best to discredit the Irish people and American citizens of Irish blood. England hopes, by painting a black picture of Irish life, to prompt American lovers of liberty to turn their eyes away.

The methods of Lord Northcliffe's propaganda machine are clearly outlined in his own paper, the *London Times*, in its issue of the 4th of July, 1919, as follows:

"Efficient propaganda, carried out by those trained in the arts of creating public good-will and of swaying public opinion towards a definite purpose . . . is

now needed, urgently needed. To make a beginning. Efficiently organized propaganda should mobilize the press, the church, the stage and the cinema; press into active service the whole educational systems of both countries, and root the spirit of good-will in the homes, the universities, public and high schools and primary schools. *It should also provide for subsidizing the best men to write books and articles on special subjects, to be published in cheap editions or distributed free to classes interested.*

"Authoritative opinion upon current controversial topics should be prepared both for the daily press and for magazines; histories and textbooks upon literature should be revised. New books should be added, particularly in the primary schools. Hundreds of exchange university scholarships should be provided. Local societies should be formed in every centre to foster British-American good-will, in close cooperation with an administrative committee. Important articles should be broken up into mouthfuls for popular consumption, and booklets, cards, pamphlets, etc., distributed through organized channels to the public.

"Advertising space should be taken in the press, on the boardings, and in the street cars for steadily presenting terse, easily read and remembered mind-compelling phrases and easily grasped cartoons, that the public may subconsciously absorb the fundamentals of a complete mutual understanding."

When Prof. Edward Raymond Turner of the University of Michigan introduced to the American people a volume entitled "Ireland and England," it was widely advertised as an "impartial, comprehensive and authoritative" story of the Irish situation. Examination, however, shows it to be exactly the opposite.

Americans of Irish blood have decided that misrepresentation of Ireland and of the Irish people must come to an end in the United States of America. They insist that

the truth be told, and stand ready to point out misrepresentations and to condemn those who sponsor them.

The Irish National Bureau presents in this pamphlet a detailed review of Prof. Turner's book. It leaves it to readers to judge for themselves whether Prof. Turner of the University of Michigan has been "impartial, comprehensive and authoritative," or whether he has, knowingly or unknowingly, enlisted in the ranks of those who serve England.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December, 1919.

REVIEW

By Daniel T. O'Connell

The Century Company of New York has recently published a book entitled "Ireland and England." The author of this book is Edward Raymond Turner, professor of European History in the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, Mich. The book is dedicated to Eleanor Bowie Turner and E. B. T. in acst. mem.

The publishers in the advertising notes on the paper wrapper of the book, which were no doubt written by the author himself, call it "an impartial, comprehensive, authoritative history of Ireland in its relations to England, covering especially the effort of Ireland to gain its independence." The publishers also state that this book "adequately meets the want of Americans for a clear, comprehensive, unbiased report on the whole subject." It is further asserted that "Professor Turner has collected and arranged his material with the thoroughness and understanding of a conscientious scholar." The author himself, in his preface, states that "he has written the book with the desire of helping to bring about a better understanding of a question which is very troublesome and perplexing not only to the Irish and the English but less directly to the people of the United States." He complains that "in America Irish matters are usually discussed by extremists" and states that "he has wished to write without prejudice and do justice to all." Again and again the author reverts to his purpose and desire to be impartial, and it is on the basis of this purpose that he rests his claim to a hearing from the people of the United States, whom he professes to instruct on the subject of the relations of England and Ireland, because, as he asserts, "a correct appreciation of the general bearing of the Irish question and its difficulties has not generally existed in this

country, partly through lack of information" (p. 439).

The book has been supplemented by an article in the August number of Mr. Arthur Page's "World's Work," which, although it contains nothing new, serves to bring into clearer light the character, the competence and the animus of the author.

The time was admirably chosen for the publication of such a book, and the American people are invited to buy it on the assurance that they will find in it full and accurate information on a subject in which very many of them have a sentimental interest and in the settlement of which all of them are now profoundly concerned. The reasons why they should buy this book are many and strong. It has behind it the reputation of a great publishing firm; it is the work of a man who holds a position of trust and responsibility in a great educational institution; it deals with an historical subject on which the author writes in his capacity as a professional historian, and on the word of the author and his publishers we have it that it is the work of a thorough and conscientious scholar.

In spite, however, of the reputation of the Century Company, of the position of the author, of his professions of impartiality, and the assurance of author and publisher that the book is the fruit of the labor of a conscientious scholar, "Ireland and England," by Edward Raymond Turner, is not history; it is not impartial; it is not comprehensive; it is not authoritative; it is not the product of a scholar; it is not American. It is not history because it sins against all the recognized canons of historical composition; it is not impartial because it betrays on every page passion and prejudice; it is not comprehensive because it suppresses all mention of sub-

stantive facts and events; it is not authoritative because it rests on superficial knowledge, colored and warped by prejudice; it is not the work of a scholar because it gives no evidence of a sincere effort to know the truth; and it is not American because it lacks the essentially American quality of fair play, because the author's point of view is not American, and because it contains unwarranted flairs and flings at things American.

It Is Not History. No work can be regarded as history which does not give evidence that its author was acquainted with the technique which has raised history to the rank of a science. Where acquaintance with technique and the scientific spirit are absent there can be no history. The material with which the historian works is evidence. Under the hands of the man who knows the rules governing the collection, criticism and exegesis of evidence and who is guided by the scientific spirit, this evidence is transformed into history, into a mirror, a presentation of truth. The evidence is found in sources, primary or secondary, original or derivative. To be unacquainted with the sources or to misunderstand authorities can result only in caricature or misrepresentation. The author of this book has obviously no acquaintance with the primary sources of Irish history; he is not acquainted with the Irish language, and wherever primary sources are quoted it is at second hand. In addition, he frequently lays himself open to the charge of not having understood his secondary authorities. As might be expected, a bibliography is appended to the book. It is incomplete and insufficient, and yet the author does not positively state that he has used it. He says, "It is a list known to me or useful in the writing of this book." An incomplete bibliography betokens either dishonesty or ignorance. Yet it is on the basis of this superficial, utterly inadequate knowledge of the subject that he has had the effrontery to designate his work a history.

It is not authoritative. Not only is the author unacquainted with the essential primary sources and almost entirely unversed in the secondary literature of the subject, but his work is a travesty on Historical

Methodology and a crime against Historical Technique. There are three characteristics of his method, which are found in every chapter and practically on every page, which cause one to wonder whether he wishes to be taken seriously or whether he is clowning his way through the performance. Viewing the matter as charitably as possible, no conclusion is possible other than that he was induced to rush into print with such an utterly unscientific preparation for the task that his work necessarily bears an unscientific character, and that it is marked all through with such vicious partisanship as to forfeit all claim to the name of history. It is conjectural where it should be certain; it is cloudy where it should be clear; it is erroneous where it should be truthful.

It is conjectural. No man who possesses exact information and who is not actuated by the will to deceive will give a narrative purporting to be history a form that might be borrowed from the style of gossips around a town pump. This is precisely what the author of this book has done. He is the town-pump type of historian. From the first page to the last, with painful reiteration, we meet the phrases "it has been said," "it has been wisely said," "it has been conjectured," "it has been held," "it is thought," "it may be that," "most popular writers," "it was considered," "some believed," "it would seem," "it began to seem," "observers say," "some people have thought," "some writers," "competent observers," "men said," "some have wondered," "many Englishmen," "most people say," "it is asserted," "statesmen knew," "it has been justly said," etc., etc. It is conceivable that an author, in dealing with a remote period, about which he has only the most superficial knowledge, might resort to such a device in order to hide his insufficiency; but no such excuse exists in cases where he is dealing with matters of common knowledge. We could wish that we had been spared the tiresome task of reading about what was said, or what was conjectured, or what competent observers say, or what some people think regarding the fourth, or the tenth, or the eighteenth century, and we shall spare others by refraining from quoting any of

these gems of wisdom. We shall take the liberty, however, of giving a few specimens of the author's method in dealing with current events. As these specimens are typical, we shall have more to say about them further on. The author (p. 406) speaks about "ideal lurking places (for submarines) on the Irish coast." Then we find the statement, "It is said German submarines did get some assistance on the Irish coast." A little further on rumor and gossip have become fact, for we find the positive assertion, "German submarines got petrol and supplies on the coast." Another passage is so characteristic that it is worth quoting in full as an example of Professor Turner's *conscience historique*, "Representatives were sent by the Philadelphia Convention to Ireland, where they were received with wild ovation, since they, like the Sinn Fein leaders, just before, seemed to promise that the Peace Conference would take up Ireland's case, and that Irish independence would follow soon after. Their activities were regarded by many of the British people with considerable coolness and suspicion. It was believed that no other government than the British would have permitted such delegates to act as these Americans did; and it was thought that such tolerance had been a grievous mistake, since competent observers were now declaring that the Irish people were so wrought upon and so inflamed that only by a miracle would it be possible to avert a rebellion worse than the one the year before."

These are typical examples of how this Professor of History presents his subject. That a professional historian should have recourse to a method so obviously dishonest, so patently intended to deceive, is hardly more inexplicable than that he should have such a low opinion of the intellectual calibre of the people for whom the book is intended. Were it not that such statements as those quoted above are soberly set forth by a professor in a university supported by the citizens of a great Commonwealth, it might easily be believed that they were made by some flippant reporter on a yellow journal. It may be that the uncertainty which comes from inadequate knowledge, the timidity arising

from partial assimilation of secondary sources, may have led the author to resort to the device of anonymity in order to conceal his ignorance, or he may have had the hope that he could thus make a show of erudition to impress the unwary. There is one chapter, however, for which no such plea can be made, and which marks the author as a charlatan and an impostor. In the chapter entitled "Arguments About Home-Rule," the author, after an entirely uncalled-for assertion that "he holds no brief in this chapter," repeats *ad nauseam* the strange and weird charges made by Orangemen as arguments against home-rule, and adds, "I neither defend nor vouch for their truth." That is precisely what he should have done as an historian, especially as his work is intended as a book of instruction for Americans, from which they will be enabled to form a just estimate of the Irish question. The repetition of such charges, false and ridiculous on their face, may produce the effect he desires; they may tend to spread prejudice and error, but the honest historian would have tried to find out what they were worth, and he would have expressed his opinion. Otherwise, how can those who are desirous of forming an estimate of the merits of the case judge of the psychology of those who are influenced by such arguments. Repeating the blind ravings of Carsonite fanatics may have been Professor Turner's method of arriving at the heart of the matter, but it might reasonably be expected that a professor would take a large, philosophical view of the subject, that he would have tried to find the real issues at stake in the struggle between Carsonites and Nationalists in Ireland. To do so, however, might not suit the book of the professor. We believe that he is incapable of a large philosophical view of any subject, and that he has no conception that there is any side to the Carsonite movement but that to be found in pamphlets issued by Orange Lodges. Professor Turner constantly bases his apology for England and his opposition and animosity to all things Irish on the ground that Irishmen can trust to the fairness of the English democracy for a prompt and just settlement of Irish claims. Had he

any knowledge of the parliamentary struggles in England in recent years, he might have known that the *entente* between liberalism and democracy in England and nationalism in Ireland was due to the fact that both were striving for progressive legislation. He might have learned that the history of the Orange representatives in Parliament has been and is one of consistent and unwavering opposition to everything progressive, liberal or democratic. No movement tending to social reform or social betterment has been introduced into the House of Commons in recent years without arousing the bitter opposition of the Orangemen and especially of their present leader, Carson. Orangemen were no doubt influenced by the campaign literature issued by their lodges; the stuff will not make much impression on Americans.

Not only does the author attempt to hide his animus and his ignorance behind a shield of anonymity, but he constantly moves under a smoke screen of analogy. Practically no statement is made regarding the history of Ireland or the events of the present time which does not draw forth an analogy or a parallel of some kind. Are the English convicted of cruelty or barbarity, immediately an analogy to show that the Germans are, or were, more cruel than the English; was there religious persecution in Ireland, there was also persecution and proscription in Bohemia; there were plantations in Ireland, so, too, in the West Indies there were plantations; there were secret political societies in Ireland, and at once a disquisition on secret societies in Russia; if there were cruel landlords in Ireland, were there not Prussian junkers and Austrian nobles who were cruel? With no reason, or for any reason, we are compelled to watch the author display his store of useless knowledge in this fashion. He descants on Russian Reds and English Suffragettes, on Czecho-Slovaks and Turks, of cabbages and kings, of anything and everything, all with the purpose of showing that, bad as were the conditions in Ireland, a careful student of horrors can match them elsewhere. And to what purpose? Nobody has ever asserted that tyranny is or was a monopoly of the English or that suffering is an exclu-

sive prerogative of the Irish. The fact that oppression once existed in other countries did not and does not lighten the burden of the Irish, while the obvious natural inference that since oppression has ceased to exist in other countries it should also cease to exist in Ireland is altogether lost on Professor Turner. Following the instinct of the pettifogger, to hide a bad case by abusing somebody, he fails to see what is so clear to others, even to Englishmen. Major Erskine Childers can teach him that "Ireland is now the only white nationality in the world where the principle of self-determination is not, at least in theory, conceded." The appeal to the analogy, to the far-fetched parallel, to abuse of others, is a form of timid emotionalism, of cowardice which cannot take the place of thought and reasoned conviction. Such silly scolding will impress a normal circle of normal men and women as nothing more than the vapid outpourings of a mind shackled by prejudice and too weak for objective reality. Nobody will withhold a measure of pity from a professor and an historian who, in order to bolster up a bad case, has so far forgotten the dignity of his calling and his profession as to resort to such questionable devices as those of anonymity and the analogy.

The author is a purveyor of error and misrepresentation. It can be said without exaggeration that there are few direct statements in this book to which exception cannot be taken as an open contravention of truth or fact. Many statements are so absurdly erroneous that no schoolboy would be guilty of them. Thus we are told that the Bull *Laudabiliter* was issued by Pope Alexander III; that, "generally speaking, Ireland is passing into the hands of its people more than any other country." Such utterances as this latter betray such an abysmal ignorance of the conditions of land-tenure throughout the world that one is tempted to lay the book aside and to say a prayer that there may be few such books in the future. Has the author compared the land situation in Ireland with that in other countries besides the three he mentioned, Russia, Serbia and France? Apparently not. We are told that Daniel O'Connell, after his condemnation by a

packed jury in Ireland, appealed to the House of Lords, "which, with the fairness which English tribunals are accustomed to use, reversed the sentence of conviction." The packed jury is as much an English institution as the House of Lords or the public house. Does this professor expect to impose on people of intelligence by such a statement as the following: "Of Ulster's representatives in the House of Commons, nearly as many supported home-rule as desired a continuance of the Union"? The exact numbers were: Home-rulers, 17; Unionists, 16. To attempt to call attention to all the author's misstatements in regard to Irish history or, in fact, in matters of general culture, would mean taking him into elementary classes in both. Through page after page, chapter after chapter, the author stumbles, trips and strays; he leaves behind him a trail of error, vagueness and analogy, and yet what he has done is called "an authoritative, impartial and scholarly history." Pity gives place to indignation, however, when he is found shutting his eyes to facts which are matters of common knowledge and which the attentive perusal of the daily papers would have revealed to him. His failure to find those facts is all the more culpable because he has listed in his bibliography books which contain the very information which would have made his narrative appear like history. Even when he attempts to represent the political conditions in Ireland on a map, he departs from reality. At his instigation, no doubt, the Pages have printed a map in their "World's Work" with the subscript, "How Ireland is divided against itself," which, to speak mildly, is a graphic misrepresentation. Ireland is not divided politically according to provincial boundaries.

The same set purpose of misrepresentation and malicious distortion of fact and truth is found constantly on the printed page, especially in the last third of the book, which is devoted to the consideration of contemporary events. In this portion of his narrative the author aims at bringing out certain views, viz., that there is disloyalty in Ireland, due to the machinations of certain persons who are guilty of the crime of desiring to make

Ireland a free republic; these persons are the Sinn Feiners; during the war these Sinn Feiners entered into treasonable conspiracies with the Germans with the purpose of throwing off the English yoke; during the war these same Sinn Feiners provoked an unwarranted rebellion in Ireland; the Sinn Feiners and many people in Ireland were pro-German; they aided German submarines; Ireland refused to do its full part in the war, and representatives from the Irish Race Convention in Philadelphia went to Ireland and fomented rebellion.

The author centers his attack on Sinn Fein. He muddles his way through several pages, which he would have his readers believe are a summary of the history of that organization. He speaks of the origin of the Sinn Fein movement without even mentioning the name of Arthur Griffith, its founder, and the man who has directed its policies from the beginning. This omission is all the more notable because Griffith gets full credit for his work in some books in the author's bibliography. Sinn Fein cannot be understood apart from Arthur Griffith. Had this professor of modern history any knowledge of Arthur Griffith? If he had, he is guilty of a most contemptible piece of deception in failing to advert to him. If he had not, he should never have attempted to write about Sinn Fein. Arthur Griffith is not only a striking figure in the public life of Ireland, but a man of international importance.

Professor Turner tells us that Sinn Fein was established in 1905, that "it was at first merely an aspect of the Irish Revival," but "soon it became the new great force in the politics of the Island;" "it was soon connected with the Irish Republican Brotherhood, another society disloyal to the British Government;" "soon the leaders adopted active and troublesome politics, and more and more the movement was guided by violent extremists." No proofs, it is hardly necessary to say, are given for any of these assertions. It would be interesting to know the sources of the author's information, if he has any. He gives us to understand that after the outbreak of the war Roger Casement organized and drilled volunteers

in Dublin. Some of the authorities listed by the learned professor say that Casement went to Germany from America after the outbreak of hostilities. How does the professor transport him through the war zone?

Nothing in the whole book is more characteristic of the book and the man, of the production and the professor who produced it, of animus, analogy and error, than the effort to fasten on Sinn Fein and the Irish people the guilt of having aided German submarines during the war. On page 456 attention is directed to the numerous bays and indentations along the Irish coast, "ideal lurking places for submarines, where they might, if the inhabitants ashore wished, very well receive supplies and assistance." Further down on the same page we find a statement exhibiting that peculiar mental perversion for which the author's general style might have prepared us. "It is said that German submarines did get some assistance on the coast." To the mind of this professor, presumably from his position a reputable man and from his training a gentleman, the possibility of evil is presumptive proof of guilt, good and sufficient reason for making a charge of the most serious character, for, on page 458, we read: "After German submarines had got petrol and supplies on the coast."

Admiral Sims, the Canadian-born head of the American navy in European waters during the war, a man from whom England had no secrets, a man whose utterances in Pages' "World's Work" proves him as bitterly anti-Irish as Professor Turner, states positively in his "Own Story": "These U-boats did not have bases off the Irish and Spanish coasts. Such bases would have served no useful purpose. . . . Bases on the Irish coast would have been useful only in case they could replenish the torpedoes, and this was obviously an impossibility." Thus one essential postulate in the author's arraignment of Sinn Fein is exploded. Unless the author and his publishers are in a catch-penny conspiracy to sell a malicious piece of propaganda, the denial of such a serious charge, a charge which is the keystone of all that is said against Sinn Fein, they should immediately withdraw the book from circulation, with apologies to

the American people for having attempted such an imposition.

Another charge equally grave and equally groundless is that found in the story of the famous or infamous "German Plot," which, although it was repudiated in England from the beginning, is here repeated without reservation or explanation. The author says positively that, "The British Government published from documents taken, evidence purporting to show that Sinn Fein had entered into correspondence with Germany for the furtherance of its measures." The announcement of the discovery of this plot was first made by Carson, and for alleged complicity in it eighty-one persons were arrested and deported to England. They were kept in prison for ten months, they were never tried, and the evidence on which they were held has never been published. The evidence was never published, because such evidence never existed. The government, the Lloyd-George junta, has been taunted in Parliament and in the press with its failure to produce the evidence. It has never done so, for the good reason that such evidence never existed. Honest Englishmen blush with shame at the dishonor to their government and to their race in being connected with such a shady transaction. One of these Englishmen. Mr. McKean, speaking in the House of Commons June 25, 1918, had, among other things of like tenor, this to say: "I honestly believe that no government ever occupied a more humiliating position than the present government occupies with this miserable plot business. The whole thing wears upon it the stamp of unreality, not to use any stronger word. If there is any doubt whatever as to the lack of genuineness of this plot, we get it in Lord Wimborne's speech in the House of Lords last week. Lord Wimborne is not an irresponsible person. What the Government had got to do was to throw over this whole business of the plot, because after that declaration of Lord Wimborne's, there is no man who will believe in the reality of this plot."

In attempting to influence the American people by holding up to their gaze a thing so distasteful to Englishmen, Professor Turner has earned for himself a castigation at the

hands of some Englishman similar to that administered to the Anglo-maniac New York Times and New York Tribune by Mr. Clement Shorter in the pages of the Westminster Gazette.

Let us take another example of Professor Turner's ethics as a teacher and his accuracy as an historian. Throughout his chapters in the third section of his book he constantly and persistently assails Sinn Fein. He accuses Sinn Feiners of disloyalty. When did disloyalty to an alien and oppressive government become a crime in American eyes? He holds up his hands, rolls his eyes and beats his breast at the thought that the Sinn Feiners did not give a welcome to the English King when he visited Ireland, and in order to pack the jury and to prejudice the court he constantly asserts that they were pro-Germans. The culmination of their crimes was the "Easter Rebellion." For this rebellion the Sinn Feiners are held entirely responsible. It would be an honor to them if they could claim that glory. The point, however, is not one of opinion, but of fact, because it is on this fact of the Easter Rebellion, and on his maudlin references to the condition of the Allies at the time, that Professor Turner rests his indictment of Sinn Fein. If the Sinn Feiners did not cause the Easter insurrection, then the entire third part of this anti-Sinn Fein screed has no point. What are the facts? P. S. O'Hegarty, who was in a position to know all that took place and whose standing as an author is secure, whose pamphlet is on the professor's list, says ("Sinn Fein, An Illumination," page 52): "As a matter of actual fact, Sinn Fein had nothing to do with the insurrection, which was, as even the Hardinge Commission evidence shows, a Fenian insurrection. Of the seven men who signed the Republican proclamation only one was in any sense a Sinn Feiner—Sean MacDiarmada—and most of the others would have objected very strongly to being identified with Sinn Fein. Of the Sinn Fein leaders proper, most were not out in the insurrection at all, nor were they apparently in the counsels of the men who directed it." The point here is not whether the Sinn Fein leaders lost a chance

of glory by not being out, but whether the record is to be kept clear in order that the American people may have the chance of arriving at a just decision. Sinn Fein had not appealed to a majority of the Irish people until after the insurrection. The insurrection made Sinn Fein, not Sinn Fein the insurrection. Professor Turner says of the pamphlet in question that it was "written by an ardent advocate." He does not seem to comprehend that truth is compatible with ardent advocacy. He himself has read O'Hegarty's pamphlet, and yet he states the case contrary to the facts.

One other case to which reference has already been made may be again referred to, because it is so typical of the author, his style and his character. Speaking of the visit of the representatives sent to the Peace Conference by the Irish Race Convention in Philadelphia, he says, "Representatives were sent by the Philadelphia Convention to Ireland, where they were received with wild ovation, since they, like the Sinn Fein leaders just before, seemed to promise that the Peace Conference would take up Ireland's case, and that Irish independence would follow soon after. Their activities were regarded by many of the British people with considerable coolness and suspicion. It was believed that no other government than the British would have permitted such delegates to act as these Americans did; and it was thought that such tolerance had been a grievous mistake, since competent observers were now declaring that the Irish people were so wrought upon and so greatly inflamed that only by a miracle would it be possible to avert a rebellion worse than the one three years before."

The author seems to be especially bitter on this point of the American mission. He returns to it in his article in Pages' "World's Work." He says, "Two of our citizens went forth," "Messrs. Walsh and Dunne went to Ireland, not to study the situation and give wise advice, but with minds beforehand made up, with hearts filled with the most unpromising spirit of Sinn Fein, and all too ready to talk the language of irreconcilable Irish-American newspapers, they went from

one place to another and continued to make simple-minded Irishman believe that the United States might bring about all that Sinn Fein had promised." It is not possible to quote in full all that the author has to say in Pages' monthly about this mission, but were it possible or desirable to do so, the same verdict would apply to both book and periodical. There is not a single direct statement in either which is true.

The Race Convention sent representatives to the Peace Conference in Paris, not to Ireland; they sent three, not two. These gentlemen went from Paris to Ireland with passports from the British and with the openly avowed purpose of communicating with the representatives of the Irish people. They did not *seem* to promise nor did they promise that the Peace Conference would take up Ireland's case. The matter was settled before they left Paris. They made no predictions nor prophecies as to whether Irish independence would follow soon after or long after. "Regarded by many of the British people with coolness and suspicion." American uniforms in England were regarded with more than coolness, and the wearers were treated with violence, whenever the hospitable Britons could do so with safety. *It was believed.* By whom? Where? When? *It was thought.* By whom? Where? When? *Competent observers.* Who? Where? When? *Language of irreconcilable Irish-American newspapers.* Irreconcilable with what? With tyranny. With English junkerism. *And contrived to make, etc.* Where? When?

These statements and many others like them were not made in jest. They were set down in all seriousness by a professor of history. If history is taught to the students at Ann Arbor in the fashion it is here dished up for the public by one of their professors, then heaven help the students at Ann Arbor. Nothing but moral perversion can explain how a thing which would not be accepted by any professor in any school in the country as an exercise in history should be pawned off on the public by a professor of history. The debasement of historical fact to propa-

ganda is not easily forgiven in anybody; it is a crime in a professor.

The book is not impartial. Not only in the fact that he puts himself forward as the advocate of a special plan of settlement of the Irish question, which has never been officially proposed in England, and which, as far as can be seen, is the scheme outlined in the Northcliffe publications; not only in the fact that he constantly slurs the Irish who dare to speak of independence, and that he is always the defender of everything English and Carsonite, does the author give the lie to his assertions of impartiality, but his violent abuse of those who entertain views not acceptable to English junkerdom mark him out as a partisan, a special pleader, a rabid and intemperate propagandist. Does impartiality sit well with such phrases as "silly and immoderate," "vehement Irish recalcitrants," "contemptible and silly," "wild and unjust," "childlike and foolish," "violent extremists," "rebels," "virulent campaign"? Yet by some strange psychological twist the author is able to say with sanctimonious unctuousness, "Sinn Fein and its idea of complete independence for Ireland I have tried to discuss sympathetically." Discrepancy between statement and fact is sometimes designated by "a short and ugly word."

It is not comprehensive. It is a fundamental postulate not only in the maintenance of justice, but in normal human intercourse that when men speak they should tell not only the truth, but the whole truth. The *Suppressio veri* is not less base among men of honor than the *Assertio falsi*. In this book the author offers himself as a qualified witness to the American people in order that, by his testimony, they may be in a position to pronounce verdict on the claims of the Irish people to independence. If he is a reliable witness, he will suppress nothing that is essential, nothing that is capital. Let us see how he fares as a witness.

In the events leading up to the establishment of the Sinn Fein Parliament, in the events that have united Ireland today in its demand for complete separation from England there are some of such vital import that they cannot be omitted without distort-

ing the whole story. The present condition of Ireland had its beginning in the passage of the Home-Rule Bill by the Asquith ministry in 1912. The first Gladstone Home-Rule Bill was defeated in the Commons. The second Gladstone Home-Rule Bill endorsed by the English Democracy passed the House of Commons, but was assassinated in the House of Lords. Gladstone retired a beaten man, too old or too timid to take up the problem of removing the House of Lords not only from the way of home-rule but from that of many other urgent liberal reforms. The House of Lords blocked the way to anything like liberal or democratic legislation, until its power of obstruction was partly destroyed by the Parliament Act of 1911. After the passage of this act, the English democracy again decided for home rule, and again the bill was passed by the Commons. The aristocracy now adopted new tactics, and with the aid of Carson they inflamed Orange bigotry and fanaticism in the north of Ireland by means of the arguments to which Professor Turner gives so much space in this book, and by contributions of money. The author does not dwell on this phase of the question, nor does he advert to this attack on that democracy of which he is so fond of speaking. He does not show where the strength of the Carson Covenanters lay, namely, in the English aristocracy, nor does he see in the Orange movement a warfare on democracy. He omits all mention of the great, outstanding fact in modern English history, the flouting of the will of the people by an arrogant militarism. He says nothing of the revolt of French and Gough and the English officers at the Curragh. He fails to note that these men, and those who aided and abetted them in England, set their will above the will of the English people. This fact of militaristic dictation, of defiance of democracy, is the salient feature of modern English history, the key to everything that has happened since, not only in Ireland, but perhaps in the world. There is no account of Carson's threats of revolution, not a word about the connection between the rebellion in Ulster and the outbreak of the world-war, though the American Ambassador, Mr. Ge-

rard, has been at pains to show the effect that these Ulster threats had in military circles in Berlin. There is no mention of the assurances the Carsonites said they had received from the Kaiser. Yet these are the facts that led to the organization of the Irish Volunteers. The author does not say that Carson's Covenanters were allowed to import arms from Germany, while all the machinery of government was set in motion when the Irish Volunteers attempted to arm themselves. No reference is made to the slaughter of innocent persons in the streets of Dublin by the brutal commander of the King's Own Royal Scottish Borderers. These are the essential connecting links in the series of events in Ireland between 1912 and 1916. The author gives a chapter to "Conscription in Ireland." He says nothing as to why the Irish, who had volunteered out of all proportion to their military population at the beginning of the war, lost their enthusiasm for the English army. Mr. Lloyd George, speaking in the House of Commons on October 18, 1916, said, "Some of the stupidities (which sometimes look like malignities) which were perpetrated at the beginning of recruiting in Ireland are beyond belief. . . . I remember that I was perfectly appalled at the methods adopted to try and induce the Irish people to join the ranks." No amount of false rhetoric and bad grammar, no mud slinging, no violent denunciation of the Irish as pro-Germans, no lacrimose references to stabbing England in the back, can hide these lacunae in the narrative. Nothing that the author has said or can say will save him from the ugly epithet applied to those who suppress the truth.

It is not the work of a scholar. The scholar, the man worthy the name, does not seek for meretricious effects; his only guide is the lamp of truth. He scorns innuendo and suggestion; he neither rants nor reviles. Professor Turner, after speaking of the failure of the insurrection in Dublin in 1916, couples with his narrative of that failure a statement so utterly lacking in proof as to brand him an impostor and a coward. He says, page 378, "German warships did dash out to bombard English coast towns, but this

brought no assistance to the Irish Republic." What is the obvious inference? That this was part of a prearranged plan between the Irish and the Germans. Scholarship knows no such device as this. Yet throughout the book we find the same trick repeated time and again by linking the Irish with movements and men who are the objects of public obloquy and hatred.

The book is not American. The American will never condemn any man without giving him a fair hearing. The author of this book, through his publishers, proclaims that he is neither pro-Irish nor pro-English. Neither is he American. He quotes some mythical publisher to the effect that unless a book is pro-Irish it will not sell. By that statement alone he has condemned himself. He has unwittingly revealed himself as one of that class of foreign propagandists who are trying to force on the American public things which the American soul knows instinctively to be un-American. His point of view is un-American. He asserts again and again, and he ventures to assume the role of prophet in asserting, that Ireland cannot and will not attain its independence, because an independent Ireland is opposed to England's control of the seas. His method of argumentation justifies the attack on Belgium, the subjection of Serbia, the slaughter in Egypt, and every crime of imperialism and militarism known to history. He heaps abuse and scorn on the heads of the Irish because they desire independence, because they sought aid from France in the past. When did the love for liberty become a crime in the eyes of an American? When Pershing said: "Lafayette, we are here," did he glory in a thing which this author finds a crime in another people? The work is un-American because the author, in his effort to exalt the English, depreciates Americans and throws discredit on their history. He speaks of the "so-called War of 1812"; he speaks of America driving Spain out of Florida and taking the Southwest from Mexico in a manner "not now to be thought of with pride"; he tells us that "the people of Great Britain, properly from their point of view, looked upon Americans, whom they did not know very well, as rude

and uncultured, as rough and uncouth, as pioneers and beginners, undeveloped and provincial; and there was certainly a great deal of truth in all of this." Are Americans to be asked to renounce the glories of the past, to repudiate the men who established the Republic; are they to remake their histories and forget the old belief that "the United States won freedom from a hateful England . . . because these ideas were widely held by many of the less well-informed in America, whose only knowledge came from inferior textbooks, filled with archaic mistakes, and whose prejudices were fostered by common politicians playing on that ignorant patriotism so often helpful to scoundrels"? The history of the Revolution and the War of 1812 and the rest of the history of this country has, therefore, been merely the work of common politicians, a device concocted by scoundrels to hoodwink the ignorant, and henceforth, unless a man is to be considered the victim of scoundrels, he must not take pride in George Washington, nor Monroe, nor Adams, nor Lincoln, nor Cleveland.

After reading some passages in this book one may well ask himself whether there is any limit to the patience of the American people or whether patriotism is not a dead and despised thing at some of our centers of the higher learning, and whether it might not be a good plan to extend the movement for Americanization to some of our universities.

The examination of literary products such as that of Professor Turner is not a pleasure. Besides the tiresome repetition of the utterly meaningless and misleading impersonal phrases, "it was said," "it was believed," "it was conjectured," etc., etc., and the never-ceasing recurrence of inapplicable analogies, the style of the author is so sophomoric, so muddled at times, as to smother his ideas, if, indeed, he ever had any, on some of the subjects he discusses. Over it all, however, lies the shadow of a purpose, a purpose to induce the American people to take the views of a certain class of English imperialists, to induce them to look kindly on a surrender of all those principles and purposes for which they poured out blood and treasure in the late war, to lead them to look with favor on English

world-hegemony. In the pages of this book liberty, self-determination, independence seem to be matters for contempt, for ridicule, things loathsome and to be avoided.

This manifest purpose naturally raises the question, Whom does the author speak for and whom does he seek to represent? He cannot be presumed to speak for America, for his theories are in open contradiction to American traditions and the spirit of American institutions. Neither can he be presumed to speak for Englishmen as a whole. His defense is of the junker class in England; but that class have the manners of gentlemen. They do not use the snuffling tone of evangelical hypocrisy that runs through this book. They will lie and deceive, they will talk about liberty and democracy and the rights of small nations, they will profess adherence to American principles of liberty before the American Congress, and they will accept the peace program of the head of the American nation, with pockets bulging with secret treaties that make that program a mockery; but they do not whine and cry. Neither does the author speak for the masses of England, for that English democracy, about which he talks so much, has already committed itself to the things which he assails and repudiates.

The Century Company of New York would not publish an obscene book, because it does not wish that men should be unclean; it would not publish a manual for thieves, because it would not have men dishonest; it would not publish a disloyal book, lest men

should become traitors. It should not publish a book which will keep men from seeing the truth, which may make them unjust and cause them to withhold their sympathy and support from people who desire to be free.

Eleanor Bowie Turner and E. B. T. in æst. mem. (whatever that is, or was), may not have known what was in this book, but they are not honored in having it inscribed to them.

Professor Edward Raymond Turner has compromised his standing as a professor and as a student, he has thrown discredit on his profession, and he has shown himself unworthy to guide the youth of this land in the search for truth, by lending his name to a publication which can lay no claim to exaltation of purpose, to scientific distinction, or to the promotion and dissemination of truth.

The University of Michigan will suffer in the estimation of scholars everywhere if it allows to pass unrebuked such an open assault on scholastic standards and academic integrity.

The legislators of the State of Michigan will be recreant to their duty if they do not seek to find out whether the University of Michigan is to be dominated by the spirit of the American Constitution or by the propagandist purposes of Northcliffe and Carson, if they do not secure some assurance that it is to be a place for the defense and inculcation of the principles of American democracy rather than a housing place for reactionary exponents of English imperialism.

Model Printing Company
Washington